

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

PCT

TRANSLATION

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

<p>To:</p>		<p>Date of mailing (day/month/year)</p>
<p>Applicant's or agent's file reference P37840-P0</p>		<p>FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below</p>
<p>International application No. PCT/JP2005/000689</p>	<p>International filing date (day/month/year) 20.01.2005</p>	<p>Priority date (day/month/year) 21.01.2004</p>
<p>International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC</p>		
<p>Applicant MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.</p>		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

<p>Name and mailing address of the ISA/JIP</p>	<p>Authorized officer</p>
<p>Facsimile No.</p>	<p>Telephone No.</p>

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000689

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/000689

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1, 2</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u>2</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1, 2</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP, 59-161139, A (Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation), 11 September, 1984 (11.09.84), claims (1) and (5); page 2, lower right column, lines 4-7; page 3, lower left column, lines 4-7 (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 2: JP, 7-79473, A (Mitsubishi Electric Corporation), 20 March, 1995 (20.03.95), abstract, claims 1-4, paragraphs [0019], [0020] and [0027]-[0032], Figs. 1-4 (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 3: JP, 10-28282, A (NTT Docomo Inc.), 27 January, 1998 (27.01.98), full text, all drawings (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 4: JP, 3-143123, A (Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation), 18 June, 1991 (18.06.91), the claims (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 5: JP, 4-79527, A (Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation), 12 March, 1992 (12.03.92), the claims (Family: none)</p> <p>Claim 1</p> <p>The subject matter of claim 1 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1-5 cited in the ISR.</p> <p>Document 1 (claims (1) and (5), page 2, lower right column, lines 4-7, and page 3, lower left column, lines 4-7), document 2 (abstract, claims 1-4, paragraphs [0019], [0020] and [0027]-[0032], and Figs. 1-4) and document 3 (abstract and claims 1-4) cited in the ISR describe a configuration in which accessible information is broadcasted as a broadcast signal in a plurality of base stations using different frequencies.</p> <p>Document 4 or 5 cited in the ISR describes that data showing permission of transmission or prohibition of transmission is broadcasted as a broadcast signal from a base station.</p> <p>Thus, a person skilled in the art could have easily conceived that the broadcast signal described in document 4 or 5 is used as the broadcast signal described in documents 1-3.</p> <p>Claim 2</p> <p>The subject matter of claim 2 appears to involve an inventive step in view of the documents cited in the ISR. Documents 1-5 do not describe that a voice signal and a data signal are sent and received, and moreover, a person skilled in the art could not have easily conceived of sending and receiving a DTMF signal.</p>			